

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. No claims have been amended in this response.

In the Office Action mailed October 20, 2003, claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,690,705 to Holmes et al. ("Holmes") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,791,969 to Lund.

The applicant's attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on November 12, 2003. During that telephone conference, the Office Action, the Holmes and Lund references, and claim 1 were discussed. The Examiner agreed that claim 1 is patentable over Holmes and Lund. The following remarks summarize and expand upon the points discussed during the November 12 telephone conference.

A. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes in view of Lund. In accordance with the agreement reached with the Examiner during the November 12 telephone conference, the Section 103 rejection of claim 1 will be withdrawn.

Claims 2-23 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 2-23 should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1.

B. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing remarks, all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, requests reconsideration of the application and an

allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner notices any informalities in the claims, he is encouraged to contact David Dutcher at (206) 359-6465 to expediently correct any such informalities.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



David T. Dutcher

Registration No. 51,638

Date: Nov. 19, 2003

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096

Perkins Coie LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000